

MEMORANDUM

2153

TO: PATENT PROVIDERS

FROM: John H. Stowe
STAAS & HALSEY

RE: Docket No.: 1317.1031D
Serial No.: 09/556,978

DATE: July 1, 2002

Received

JUL 01 2002

Technology Center 2100

Paul:

Please **HAND CARRY** the Response After Final Rejection to Examiner T. Kupstas,
Group Art Unit 2153 [**Please indicate Crystal Park II, 4th Floor**].

Please have the clerk initial and date the attached copy of this memorandum indicating
receipt of the above, and return the initialed copy in the run.

Please check one of the following boxes:

- | | | |
|--|----|--|
| <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> | 1. | If unable to hand deliver, leave in mailroom. Must have TODAY'S DATE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. | OK to hand deliver next day |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. | Other: _____ |

MDS:JHS:mf

Enclosure(s): Response After Final Rejection

#7
mm
9/13/02
RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 2153
Docket No.: 1317.1031D

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Young-Nam OH

Serial No. 09/556,978

Group Art Unit: 2153

Confirmation No.

Filed: April 24, 2000

Examiner: T. Kupstas

For: HYBRID DISC AND METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DISCRIMINATION SAME

Received

JUL 01 2002

Technology Center 2100

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Attention: **BOX AF**

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed April 8, 2002, and having a period for response set to expire on July 8, 2002. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. The following remarks are respectfully submitted.

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 19, 23 and 24 are pending in the application and all claims stand rejected.

The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 19, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Admitted Prior Art, as disclosed on pages 1 and 2 of the specification and FIG. 1 of the drawings, in view of U.S. Patent 5,959,946 to Tognazzini. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 1, 3 and 19, the Examiner admits that the Admitted Prior Art does not disclose [a disc] having [an] ID information in a predetermined area indicating the type that the disc is. The Examiner refers specifically to a portion of col. 6, lines 33-38 of Tognazzini as disclosing a type of hybrid disc wherein there is an area where information indicating the type of disc to be played is contained in a special area. The portion cited by the Examiner reads as